



MINISTRY OF EDUCATION

A report on a Survey of deaf children
who have been transferred from special
schools or units to ordinary schools

Carried out between 1st February and 12th April 1962

LONDON

HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE

1963

PRICE 2s. 6d. NET

PREFACE

This pamphlet is a report by Miss E. M. Johnson, one of H.M. Inspectors of Schools, of an investigation which she made into the progress of a number of deaf pupils who had transferred from special schools or classes to ordinary schools or colleges of further education. As part of the investigation, Miss Johnson had discussions with the parents and pupils in their homes, as well as with the teachers both of the special schools and of the ordinary schools and colleges.

The special schools and classes covered by the inquiry were chosen at random from an area covering about two-thirds of England.

The views and advice contained in the report are Miss Johnson's own, though the Minister is in general agreement with them. The report is now being published in the hope that it will both make a fresh contribution to knowledge and stimulate further thought and discussion.

A SURVEY OF DEAF CHILDREN WHO HAVE BEEN TRANSFERRED FROM SPECIAL SCHOOLS OR UNITS TO ORDINARY SCHOOLS

CHAPTER I

Introduction

The development of powerful hearing aids has revolutionised the educational prospects of many deaf and partially hearing children, and the production of efficient individual aids has made it possible for many who are severely handicapped, to take their place in the ordinary school after a period of special training. At the Lexington School for the Deaf, New York, U.S.A., there has been a consistent attempt to integrate able, severely deaf pupils into the full life of the ordinary school by transferring them when they were considered ready to make the change. An intensive study was carried out recently, to find out how successful these pupils had been. The findings were of such interest that it was thought useful to carry out a similar investigation in this country, but by studying severely deaf children from many schools rather than from one, since no one school in England has had such a determined policy of transfer as the Lexington School, and no one school could provide a sufficient number of cases to give validity to the results.

Size of the Field

This survey was designed to study only those children who were severely handicapped by deafness, either from birth or from very early childhood and who, having been ascertained to be in need of special educational treatment, were placed in special schools for the deaf or partially hearing for a period of training and were later transferred to ordinary schools or colleges. The enquiry was limited to those who were of school age and were receiving full-time education at school or college. Schools to which approach was made are listed in the Appendix.

A preliminary approach made to this random group of schools and units for the deaf and partially hearing showed that between July 1954 and July 1961, 154 pupils had been transferred from them to ordinary schools. Of these, some were not severely handicapped by deafness and did not come within the category of children to be studied, some had attended ordinary schools before admission to special schools and a small number were no longer receiving full-time education. None of these cases was followed up. For the remainder, 99 questionnaires asking for particulars about the early training and progress of individual children were sent out to the schools and 90 were completed and returned.

TABLE I
ANALYSIS OF SCHOOLS TO WHICH QUESTIONNAIRES WERE SENT

	Number of schools and units	Number of children transferred from special to ordinary schools	Number of questionnaires issued	Number of questionnaires returned
Units for the partially hearing ...	10	72	34	27
Schools for the partially hearing ...	4	31	28	26
Schools for the deaf ...	17	51	37	37
	31	154	99	90

Choice of Subjects

Of the 90 questionnaires completed and returned, 33 gave details of pupils who had either been admitted to special schools or units between the ages of two and seven, or had been awaiting admission during that age period. All of them, at the time they were ascertained as being in need of special educational treatment, used either gesture or no more than a few intelligible words as their means of communication. It was decided that these 33 children were comparable with the cases studied at the Lexington School and should form the basis of the survey.

TABLE II
ANALYSIS OF THE SAMPLE OF 33 CHILDREN BY SEX AND TYPE OF
SPECIAL SCHOOL FROM WHICH THEY WERE TRANSFERRED

	<i>Girls</i>	<i>Boys</i>	<i>Total</i>	
From units for the partially hearing.	8	4	12	8 of whom first attended a school for the deaf.
From schools for the partially hearing.	2	—	2	
From schools for the deaf ...	11	8	19	one of these schools has been re-organised and is now a school for the partially hearing.
	<hr/> 21	<hr/> 12	<hr/> 33	

TABLE III
AGES OF THE CHILDREN AT THE ONSET OF DEAFNESS

Congenital	25	
at 3 months	1	
at 6 months	1	
at 10 months	1	
at 18 months	1	Doubtful—Probably congenital
at 2 years	1	
at 2½ years	1	
at 3 years	1	
Not known but probably at 3 years	...	1	
		<hr/> 33	TOTAL

TABLE IV
CAUSES OF DEAFNESS

Unknown	10
Hereditary	8
Otitis Media	4
Prematurity	3
Maternal Rubella	1
Measles	1
Cerebro Spinal Meningitis	1
Virus Infection	1
Anoxia at Birth	1
Familial Goitre	1
Rhesus	1
Encephalitis	1
					<hr/> 33
					TOTAL

The ages at which these children were transferred from special to ordinary schools and colleges covered a wide range, from 4 years 8 months to 15 years. In many cases, the recommendation was made by Heads of schools, in some by the School Otologists and the School Medical Officers, and in others by the parents themselves.

TABLE V

AGES AT WHICH CHILDREN WERE TRANSFERRED FROM SPECIAL SCHOOLS
TO ORDINARY SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES

Between 4+ and 5 years of age	3
Between 5+ and 6 years of age	0
Between 6+ and 7 years of age	1
Between 7+ and 8 years of age	7
Between 8+ and 9 years of age	4
Between 9+ and 10 years of age	1
Between 10+ and 11 years of age	3
Between 11+ and 12 years of age	7
Between 12+ and 13 years of age	4
Between 13+ and 14 years of age	1
Between 14+ and 15 years of age	2
		<hr/>
		33 TOTAL
		<hr/>

The Children who were the Subjects of the Enquiry

The thirty-three children were highly individual and appeared at first sight to fall into no set categories. Their ages, at the time of the enquiry, ranged from 7 years 10 months to 17 years 10 months, their intelligence from low to high and their audiograms showed flat, high frequency and variable losses and unequal losses in the two ears. In three cases, numbers 3, 12 and 27 (see Table VI), the difference between the two ears was from 30 to 45 db. In three other cases, numbers 4, 9 and 17 the validity of the audiograms was doubtful and in one, number 29, a reliable auditory response to pure tones was unobtainable. The testing of intelligence had been done in the schools and such a variety of tests had been used that no exact comparison of intelligence could be established between the children. In some cases, no test of intelligence had been made and a general estimate was given by the Heads.

Four of the children had been considered by the teachers in the ordinary schools to be making poor progress; they were regarded as "failures" and, with the agreement of the School Medical Officers, they had been returned to their special schools. The academic progress of the 29 pupils remaining in the ordinary schools and colleges was assessed on evidence collected during visits to schools and homes in the course of the investigation. These assessments were made on a 4-point scale:—

1. Clearly Successful.
2. Moderately Successful.
3. Doubtfully Successful.
4. Very Doubtfully Successful.

These gradings are used in Table VI which sets out details of auditory acuity in the better ear, intelligence or I.Q. and an estimate of academic success at the time of the enquiry.

TABLE VI

AUDITORY ACUITY IN THE BETTER EAR, I.Q. AND ESTIMATE OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS AT THE TIME OF THE ENQUIRY

No.	Age at time of inquiry	Age at admission to special school	Age at time of transfer from special school	Number of years in ordinary school	Better Ear	HEARING LOSS IN DECIBELS				I.Q. or estimate of intelligence by H.M.	Class Assessment of academic progress made as a result of the investigation
						250	500	1K	2K	4K	
1	17:10	4:2	15	1:6	L	90	110	120	x	x	Adv. Ave. 118
2	16:1	3:1	15	1:1	L	85	100	110	x	x	Adv. Ave. 118
3	15:10	3:6	11:11	3:11	R	45	60	70	65	60	95
4	15:2	6:1	9:5	3:11	L	(65	65	65	65	65	95
5	15:1	2:6	11:10	3:3	L	30	50	70	80	90	118
6	14:9	4:9	12:4	2:5	L	15	25	35	40	40	Average
7	14:9	3:6	7:4	7:5	L	x	85	90	80	75	Average
8	14:7	6:9	13:2	1:5	R	x	30	90	x	x	High
9	14:4	5:11	11:11	2:5	L	(60	60	60	60	60	107
10	14:3	4:4	7:7	6:8	R	—	20	35	40	55	100
11	14:1	5:11	10:8	3:5	R	20	40	60	80	60	Superior
12	14:1	5:7	11:8	2:5	L	45	50	45	10	30	103
13	13:11	4:8	7:6	4:0	R	50	50	50	40	50	91
14	13:8	4:0	11:5	2:5	L	75	95	95	110	x	106
15	13:1	2:0	12:4	5:0	L	80	80	100	110	110	120
16	12:11	6:10	10:8	2:5	L	55	75	80	80	100	110
17	12:11	4:8	11:6	1:5	R	(75	75	75	75	75	122
18	12:9	5:6	8:9	4:0	R	35	45	55	65	65	96
19	12:9	6:10	7:6	5:3	R	40	55	90	80	90	115
20	12:7	6:0	12:4	0:5	L	50	55	60	60	75	92
21	12:6	3:2	8:11	3:7	R	65	70	65	x	x	125
22	12:6	5:0	12:0	0:5	R	45	70	65	75	60	125
23	12:5	5:8	7:0	5:5	R	40	65	80	80	x	Adv. Ave. 89
24	12:1	4:0	11:10	0:5	L	70	80	85	70	70	89
25	11:7	4:5	8:8	3:0	R	65	80	90	80	80	Average
26	11:7	4:6	7:2	4:5	L	60	65	60	55	65	112
27	11:2	5:11	10:9	0:5	R	20	35	45	45	45	Retarded
28	10:7	3:8	4:8	3:0	R	60	60	55	55	25	Average
29	8:11	4:0	6:11	2:1	—	unreliable response to pure tones					High
30	8:7	4:8	7:4	1:3	R	55	70	65	65	60	106
31	8:6	3:7	5:0	3:0	L	25	35	55	75	75	Average
32	8:3	5:3	8:3	0:3	L	40	40	70	70	95	Average
33	7:10	4:0	5:0	2:0	L	45	55	80	70	100	Low

This table shows that 11 of the children are severely or profoundly deaf, numbers 1, 2, 7, 11, 14, 15, 16, 21, 24, 25 and 33 and 22 are severely partially deaf or partially deaf. Study of their attainment and progress indicated that these were not always directly related to hearing loss.

Speech audiograms were supplied in so few cases that it was decided to ignore them.

Plan of the Survey

The survey was planned as a series of visits; first to the special schools or units from which the children had been transferred and then to the ordinary schools to which they had gone and to their homes, in order to see the children in their own environment and to discuss with their parents their early difficulties, their present problems and their plans for the future. Without the help and co-operation of the parents much of the value of the survey would have been lost, for it was in the relaxed atmosphere by the fireside that the parents and children unburdened themselves and gave a fuller picture of what is really involved when a severely deaf child tries to maintain his place in an ordinary school.

Distribution of Children in the Ordinary Schools

As has been already stated, four of the thirty-three children had made such poor progress in ordinary schools that they were deemed to be "failures" and had been returned to their special schools after at least two years' trial. Twenty-eight children were still attending ordinary schools and colleges. One, Number 1, had recently left but a study of her case provided considerable interest and it was decided that she should be included. These twenty-nine children were of widely differing ages and attended many types of schools.

TABLE VII

TYPES OF ORDINARY SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES IN WHICH THE CHILDREN WERE PUPILS AT THE TIME OF THE ENQUIRY

Group 1. Junior Schools

4 children. Numbers 24, 25, 27 and 30.

(No. 24 had been retained in the Unit for the Partially Hearing for a further year after 11+).

(No. 25 had been retained in the Junior School for a further year after 11+).

Group 2. Secondary Modern Schools: Non-Examination Forms

7 children. Numbers 4, 5, 7, 8, 14, 15 and 20.

(Nos. 5, 14, 15 and 20: entry was delayed for 1 year after 11+).

Group 3. Secondary Modern Schools: Examination Forms

6 children. Numbers 6, 10, 12, 18, 22 and 26.

(No. 22 entry was delayed for 1 year after 11+).

Group 4. Open Air Schools: All age

2 children. Numbers 21 and 32.

Group 5. Private Schools: All age

1 child. Number 29.

Group 6. Technical Schools

1 child. Number 23.

Group 7. Grammar Schools

5 children. Numbers 9, 11, 16, 17 and 19.

(No. 16 was retained in a Primary Unit for the Partially Hearing for 1 year beyond 11+).

Group 8. Colleges of Further Education

1 student. Number 3 (from a private High School after leaving a School for the Partially Hearing).

Group 9. Colleges of Art

2 students. Numbers 1 and 2.

(No. 1 had recently left the College but was included in the enquiry).

Total 29

CHAPTER II

ANALYSIS OF TRANSFERS

Transfer of Children from Special Schools to Ordinary Schools

Discussion with Heads of Special Schools for the Deaf and for the Partially Hearing, and with teachers in charge of Units for the Partially Hearing, showed that in some cases there had been divergence of opinion about the transfer of deaf children to ordinary schools. In 18 cases, the recommendation came from the Head of the Special School or the teacher in charge of the unit; in 3 cases, it was a joint decision between the Heads of the Special and Ordinary Schools and the parents; in 8 cases the transfer was made on parental pressure and in 4 cases it was brought about by a directive from the School Medical Officers.

Transfers Suggested by Heads of Schools for the Deaf

The Head Teachers of Special Schools had based their recommendations on the ability of the children to converse, the facility with which they learned and used language, their social awareness and their characters, and on a knowledge of their homes. The difficulties that the children would meet in an ordinary school had not always been fully realised and some children were not prepared for the very different circumstances that they encountered. There had been little recognition of the very real disadvantages that accrue to deaf children who, having spent their early years learning the basic skills of communication in words and in numbers, find themselves subsequently needing a good background of general knowledge and a wide vocabulary in order to understand the full meaning of lessons and also to have learned to think mathematically in order to follow mathematics at the secondary level.

In a few cases it had been anticipated that the deaf children, when transferred to ordinary schools, would find difficulty in adjusting themselves to the new learning situation, and that the teachers there would need some guidance in helping them to understand the problems set by impaired hearing. The Head Teachers of these Special Schools expressed concern that offers of advice and guidance had not often been accepted.

Transfers Suggested by Teachers in Charge of Schools for the Partially Hearing

The children who were transferred from Schools for the Partially Hearing had moved as a result of pressure from the parents, and not at the suggestion of the Heads of the schools.

Transfers Suggested by Teachers in Charge of Units for the Partially Hearing

The three Units for the Partially Hearing from which children were transferred to ordinary schools were primary units: in no case was there a Secondary unit to which the children might have gone had it been thought preferable. There were 12 children in this group: 5 of them were considered to be ready educationally and socially for transfer and were moved before the age of 11, 3 of them were transferred at 11+ but were retained in the first-year forms at their secondary schools for a second year, 2 of them were retained in a primary unit to await the arrival of the peripatetic teacher who had been appointed to work in those ordinary schools to which the deaf children would be transferred, 2 of them were retained in a primary unit for an additional year.

One of the children in the first group of 5 was retained in the ordinary primary school for one year after the 11+ examination but appeared to have made no progress during the year and obtained no better results at the second attempt.

Local circumstances had governed the transfer of seven of the twelve children. Their admission to ordinary schools was in the nature of an experiment to see how much progress they would be able to make. It was not based entirely upon readiness to take the step from special to ordinary school.

The Head Teachers in special schools and units were dismayed to learn that no advantage seemed to have been gained by those children who were retained in the primary schools and units for one year beyond the age at which it is customary to transfer children to secondary schools. There seemed to have been too sanguine a view of the difficulties that would be met and of the ability of the deaf children to overcome them. One of the most unexpected difficulties that was encountered by the children when they were transferred to ordinary schools was that of the inefficiency of hearing aids in an ordinary classroom. Speech audiometry under ideal listening conditions, giving up to 100 per cent discrimination of known words, gave no reliable forecast of ability to hear well during lessons in an ordinary classroom or laboratory.

Transfers Suggested by School Medical Officers

Numbers 28, 31, 33 and 13.

Three of the four children, Nos. 28, 31 and 33 who, because of natural intonation in their voices and some facility in the use of words, were recommended for transfer to ordinary schools by School Medical Officers, went from nursery classes in Schools for the Deaf. By the end of the infant stage in the ordinary schools they were considered by their teachers to be making poor progress and were re-admitted to special schools. The experience of these three cases suggests that a secure foundation of language sufficient to ensure educational progress, had not been laid by the age of five years.

The fourth child, No. 13, to be re-admitted was transferred from a special school to an ordinary school at the age of seven. She struggled to maintain her place through the junior school but her limited innate ability and her personal drive were insufficient to carry her along, even though her hearing loss and her almost natural speech ought to have given her a reasonable chance of success.

TABLE VIII
AUDIOGRAMS AND I.Q.'s OF 4 CHILDREN RE-ADMITTED TO SPECIAL SCHOOLS
Hearing Loss in Decibels

Number of Child	Ear	250	500	1K	2K	4K	I.Q. or H.M.'s Estimate	Test Used
28	L R	x 60	x 60	x 55	x 65	x 25	Average	—
31	L R	25 50	25 50	55 60	75 80	75 80	Average	—
33	L R	45 55	55 55	80 80	70 90	100 90	Low	Merrill Palmer
13	L R	60 55	50 55	50 50	40 45	45 40	91	Stanford-Binet

These four children differed from each other in many ways and although they form only a very small group on which to base an assumption, they showed, each in his or her own way, that ability to speak and to understand the speech of others, when that ability is limited and when natural acquisition of speech and language has been slow to manifest itself, are insufficient criteria on which to decide whether or not a child is ready for transfer to an ordinary school.

Number 28 was nervous and shy and although she was secure in a working class home, a rapidly increasing family afforded her parents little time to give this child the help and support she needed. On admission to a nursery class in a special school, she used only a few intelligible words. With concentrated training, development of speech was fairly rapid but, at the time of transfer, she had not acquired sufficient language to allow her to maintain a similar rate of progress in the less favourable conditions of an ordinary school. She was of average intelligence and, had her transfer been delayed until the junior stage, it is possible that she would have been more successful.

Number 31, unlike all the other children who were included in the investigation, had deaf-mute parents. He lacked the stimulus of hearing speech at home and had insufficient hearing to compensate for this lack.

Number 33, although from a good professional home, was not understood by her parents. She had a difficult temperament and had become increasingly ill-adjusted to the hurly-burly of a world that relies upon hearing and speech for communication.

Number 13 had a secure working class background. Her parents were concerned for her welfare and happiness but they had no insight into her difficulties at school and could give her no help with the lessons that she had not understood. She was of lower than average intelligence and she was overwhelmed by the bustle of life in the large primary school at which she was a pupil for four years. She lacked both ability and drive

and was considered by the teachers to be a nuisance. She herself wished to return to her former special school and her parents were in full agreement.

All these points were understood by the Head Teachers of the Schools for the Deaf from which the children were transferred and had given rise to divergences of opinion between themselves and the School Medical Officers.

Transfers at the Suggestion of Parents

In eight cases the parents had, for a variety of reasons, pressed for the transfer of their deaf children to ordinary schools at ages ranging from 8 years 0 months to 13 years 4 months. The Head Teachers of the Special Schools had not been in agreement in six of these cases but transfer had been effected. A confused picture arises here because, although in two cases the children were working under great strain and making little or no progress, two others were just maintaining their places, the fifth was receiving more help in school work than could usually be expected and the sixth, who was making excellent progress, was clearly successful in his studies. These cases are described later, in the sections dealing with the schools at which they are now pupils. From these cases it can be inferred that neither Head Teachers, School Medical Officers nor parents are always infallible in the judgments when the ability of a deaf child to receive education in an ordinary school is the question at issue.

CHAPTER III

DEAF CHILDREN AT ORDINARY SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES

GROUP 1

Children in Junior Schools

Four children, numbers 27, 30, 25 and 24 were attending junior schools. They could be classified on observation during the survey as:—

Class 1. Clearly Successful	...	2. Numbers 27 and 30
Class 2. Moderately Successful	...	0.
Class 4. Very Doubtfully Successful	1.	Number 25
Class 3. Doubtfully Successful	...	1. Number 24

Class 1

Number 27, a girl who had more than one serious handicap and who had spent much of her life in hospital, had been in full-time attendance at an ordinary school for six months. She was of only average intelligence but her hearing loss was not severe. In a small class of backward children, she was able to develop as an individual; she was stretched to her full potential but she was holding her own. It may be that she will need special help when she goes to a secondary school.

Number 30 had had eighteen months' experience of ordinary school life. Her deafness was fairly severe but, at the primary stage, her mother could and did give her help with language development and reading at home, and her own strong character enabled her to maintain her place. She, too, should be kept under supervision when the time for transfer to a secondary school is reached.

Class 2

None.

Class 3

Number 25, aged 11 years 7 months, had attended a junior school for three years and was being retained there for an additional year after the 11+ examination. He was severely deaf and although, at first, he had maintained his position and had made progress, the gulf that lies in the rate of language development between the child who understands words through the natural means of hearing and the child who gropes for understanding by other means than hearing, was widening. He had an inquiring mind and used books up to the limit of his ability. His written work was good but his speech, although natural in intonation, lacked fluency. His ability to converse was poor, and he was taking increasingly less part in oral lessons and withdrawing into himself. The standard he had already reached was largely attributable to his mother, who had worked with him unceasingly since he was a baby. It was a matter of doubt whether he would be able to continue his studies at an ordinary school.

Class 4

Number 24, a boy, 12 years of age, was being retained in the junior school for an additional year and had had experience of full-time education in an ordinary class in the school where his partially-hearing unit was housed, for only six months. He was severely deaf, and was finding great difficulty in following the lessons because his effective vocabulary was too limited. His reading was below the standard of the class, his written work was stilted, simple in construction and incorrect, and his speech, although natural in intonation and fairly intelligible, lacked fluency because he needed to search in his mind for the right words and sentence forms in which to express his ideas.

When admitted to special schools or units, three of the children, numbers 24, 25 and 30, were unable to use speech as a means of communicating their thoughts. They were unable to speak and were taught to do so.

TABLE IX
AUDIOGRAMS, I.Q.'s AND CLASSES OF 4 CHILDREN IN
PRIMARY SCHOOLS

Number of child	Ear	Hearing Loss in Decibels					IQ or H.M.'s Estimate	Test Used	Class based on observation
		250	500	1K	2K	4K			
27	L	55	60	80	65	65	Retarded Average	—	1
	R	20	35	45	45	45			
30	L	65	70	70	55	45	106	W.I.S.C.(P)	1
	R	55	70	65	65	60			
25	L	80	No response			—	Average	—	3
	R	70				70			
24	L	70	80	85	70	70	89	W.I.S.C.(P)	4
	R	75	95	90	80	70			

GROUP 2

Children in Non-Examination Forms in Secondary Modern Schools

There were 7 children in this group, numbers 4, 5, 7, 8, 14, 15 and 20. They could be classed as:—

Class 1. Clearly Successful	...	0.
Class 2. Moderately Successful	...	2. Numbers 4 and 8
Class 3. Doubtfully Successful	...	3. Numbers 5, 7 and 14
Class 4. Very Doubtfully Successful	2.	Numbers 15 and 20

Three of them were working with boys and girls of their own age.

Class 1

None.

Class 2

Numbers 4 and 8 were found to be partially-hearing but neither of them came from homes that could provide stimulus and support in pursuing their school careers, and neither was working to capacity.

Number 8 had been transferred to an ordinary school at the request of the parents at the age of 13 years. She did not become a real part of her new school community and, although her work and her attitude did not improve, neither did it deteriorate. The objective tests set by the Local Education Authority, for pupils who were leaving school, showed that her attainment had remained static.

Class 3

Numbers 5 and 14 were working with boys and girls a year younger than themselves, having been retained in the junior schools for an additional year. The language of 5 and 14 was poorly developed; their written work was muddled and limited and these pupils were unable either to comprehend the books studied in class or to appreciate fully the content of their lessons, since their ability to understand and reason in words was limited to simple sentence forms.

Their speech, although natural in intonation, was far from fluent. It retained faults that could be attributed to high frequency loss of hearing but gave the impression of immaturity to listeners who were unfamiliar with the effects of deafness. This had given rise to some teasing by fellow pupils and was a source of unhappiness and loneliness.

Number 7 was very severely deaf. In search of a more normal type of education than the parents thought a special school could provide, she had been withdrawn at the age of 7 years 4 months and presented for admission at the local primary school where she remained until the age of 11. She was then transferred to a new secondary modern school to which her father had been appointed Headmaster.

At 15, she was in her last year at school. By teaching her at home her parents had given her a good foundation of language and had taught her to read and to use books well. She took no part in the oral work of her form but, through reading, had reached a good standard in the internal examinations. She was able to speak but her voice was seldom heard outside the home and she was thought by many people to be dumb. She was not a member of any school clubs and shied away from social contact like a frightened filly. At school-leaving age she was socially ill-adjusted and quite unfitted to take a place in the industrial world in competition with people

who hear normally. Although in full-time attendance at a secondary modern school, it could not be said that she was receiving her education there. In any other circumstances, it could be assumed that she would have been unacceptable at an ordinary school.

Class 4

Numbers 15 and 20 were also working with boys and girls a year younger than themselves.

Number 15, a girl who was profoundly deaf, was quite out of her depth in an ordinary school in spite of eight hours a week of individual tuition from a Teacher of the Deaf. She had been withdrawn from a special school against the advice of the Head Mistress, then transferred for a short time to a partially-hearing unit after which, against the advice of the Education Officer and the Organiser for Deaf Education in the town, she had demanded transfer to an ordinary secondary school.

Number 20 found difficulty with the use of language and was distressed to find herself at great disadvantage in a very large school after the sheltered intimacy of a partially-deaf unit. Her mind was very confused.

TABLE X
AUDIOGRAMS, I.Q.'S AND CLASSES OF SEVEN CHILDREN IN NON-EXAMINATION FORMS IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Number of child	Ear	Hearing Loss in Decibels					I.Q. or H.M's Estimate	Test Used	Class based on observation
		250	500	1K	2K	4K			
4	L	65	63	65	65	63	95	Bradford 11+	2
	R	65	65	65	65	65			
(doubtful validity)									
8	L	5	50	90	x	x	107	Wechsler(P)	2
	R	+5	30	90	x	x			
5	L	30	50	70	80	90	118	W.I.S.C.(P)	3
	R	40	60	65	75	90			
7	L	x	85	90	80	75	High	—	3
	R	x	x	90	90	95			
14	L	75	95	95	110	x	106	Wechsler	3
	R	80	90	110	x	x			
15	L	80	80	100	110	120	120	W.I.S.C.	4
	R	90	100	100	110	105			
20	L	50	55	60	60	75	92	Wechsler	4
	R	50	55	60	65	80			

GROUP 3

Children in Examination Forms in Secondary Modern Schools

The six children in this group could be classified as :—

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----|------------------------------|
| Class 1. Clearly Successful | ... | 4. Numbers 10, 12, 18 and 26 |
| Class 2. Moderately Successful | ... | 2. Numbers 6 and 22 |
| Class 3. Doubtfully Successful | ... | 0. |
| Class 4. Very Doubtfully Successful | ... | 0. |

They were working well. One of them, number 22, had been retained in the partially-hearing unit in a primary school for an additional year after 11. He had been awaiting the arrival of a peripatetic Teacher of the Deaf who had been appointed by the Local Education Authority to follow the progress of deaf and partially-hearing children transferred from the partially-hearing units to ordinary schools in the city and to give special tuition when needed.

The speech of all these children, although retaining some faults due to impaired hearing, was fairly fluent. They were making good academic progress.

Class 1

Two of the four children who were clearly successful at their studies were severely deaf and two were partially hearing. Numbers 10, 18 and 26 had been transferred to ordinary junior schools at 8 years 0 months, 8 years 9 months and 7 years 2 months respectively. Number 12 had been transferred to a secondary modern school at 11 years 8 months.

These four children, whose success was apparent, came from families in which they were secure and from which they received very real support. They were all able to take their learning problems home to parents, brothers or sisters for explanation and clarification and were seldom failed by them. They were all able to read to the level of the class and to use books to extend their knowledge and to compensate for what they missed in lessons.

Number 10 had been withdrawn from the special school by his parents at the age of 8 years 0 months against the advice of the Head Master who had misjudged the abilities of both the boy and his parents. The Head Master of the Secondary Modern School was a little concerned that, from the evidence of the end-of-term examinations, the boy was losing his position in class but a check of his reading habits showed that he needed more guidance in the use of books in order to compensate for the discussion that he missed during lessons.

Number 12 was partially hearing. Her progress had so pleased her Head Mistress in the ordinary school that she had recommended retention at school beyond the age of 15, to take an advanced course with a view to teaching as a career.

Class 2

The two children who seemed to be moderately successful were transferred to ordinary schools at 12 years 3 months and 12 years 6 months respectively. Of these two, number 6, was a partially-hearing boy of 15 who found difficulty in his written work and homework. He did not read enough and the whole picture of his progress was masked by the help given to him by his stepmother in the evenings. He was immature and submitted far more to practice and correction than can usually be expected from boys of his age. Without consistent, concentrated help at home with his school work, it is doubtful if he would have reached such a good standard. He was a lonely boy and had no friends at school.

Number 22 was an active, intelligent, popular boy who came from a silent family of deaf-mute father, deafened mother and partially-hearing younger sister. He had a secure home but the cultural level was low. It would seem reasonable to suggest that, had he had a talking family background within which he might have learned to use his expanding vocabulary

in lively conversation, and where he might have learned to use and value good books, his success would have been more marked and more secure. He was one of the very few children who thought mathematically and had ability with numbers.

TABLE XI

AUDIOGRAMS, I.Q.'s AND CLASSES OF SIX CHILDREN IN EXAMINATION FORMS IN SECONDARY MODERN SCHOOLS

Number of child	Ear	Hearing Loss in Decibels					I.Q. or H.M.'s Estimate	Test Used	Class based on observation
		250	500	1K	2K	4K			
10	L	x	20	40	45	40	100	Moray House	1
	R	x	20	35	40	55			
12	L	45	50	45	10	30	103	W.I.S.C.(V)	1
	R	80	90	100	75	90			
18	L	35	45	55	65	x	96	N.F.E.R.	1
	R	35	45	55	65	x			
26	L	60	65	60	55	65	112	Wechsler	1
	R	60	60	65	65	60			
6	L	15	25	35	40	40	Average		2
	R	20	30	40	50	50			
22	L	65	80	70	70	60	125	Wechsler	2
	R	45	70	65	75	60			

GROUP 4

Children in Open Air Schools: All Age

There are two girls attending Open Air Schools. They could be classified as :—

Class 2. Moderately Successful ... 1. Number 32

Class 4. Very Doubtfully Successful 1. Number 21

These two girls were pupils at different Open Air Schools in the same city. They had been placed there on the advice of the Headmaster of the School for the Deaf who did not agree with the transfer of one of them and felt that the atmosphere in such schools would provide a gentler introduction to school life alongside children who hear normally, than would the ordinary primary or secondary school.

Class 2

Number 32 was making moderately successful progress. At the request of her parents, she had been transferred to an Open Air School near her home, at 7 years 11 months, and she had reasonable prospect of success.

Class 4

Number 21 was profoundly deaf. She was clever and had herself become dissatisfied with the work at the special school. She had a difficult, determined character and had demanded transfer to an ordinary school. Her mother had sought permission from the Local Education Authority and transfer had been effected at 12 years 0 months. Her speech was unintelligible to her teachers and to her fellow pupils at the Open Air

School; her language was not developed to the level of her class, and her skill in lipreading was insufficient to allow her to follow the lessons in spite of the kindly attitude of her teacher who did her best to include her and help her to understand. She had two hours' private tuition a week at her home from a Teacher of the Deaf.

After 8 months' experience of life in an ordinary school alongside hearing children, she was beginning to falter. It was regrettable that she had been refused opportunity to sit for the entrance examinations to the Mary Hare Grammar School where she might have been successful in reaching her full potential.

Both of these girls attended special tutorial sessions at an Audiology Clinic in the city, but there was inadequate liaison between the Teacher of the Deaf at the clinic and the schools from which the girls came. There was great waste of time in travelling.

TABLE XII
AUDIOGRAMS, I.Q.'S AND CLASSES OF TWO CHILDREN AT OPEN AIR SCHOOLS

Number of child	Ear	Hearing Loss in Decibels					I.Q. or H.M.'s Estimate	Test Used	Class based on observation
		250	500	1K	2K	4K			
32	L	30	40	70	70	95	Average	—	2
	R	30	45	80	x	x			
21	L	75	x	x	x	x	125	Drever-Collins (F)	4
	R	65	x	x	x	x			

GROUP 5

Children in Private Schools: All Age

There was one girl, aged 8 years 11 months, attending a private school. She could be classified as:—

Class 1. Clearly Successful ... 1. Number 29

This girl, number 29, had a second handicap. She was spastic and her response to pure tone audiometry was unreliable, but she appeared to be partially hearing. Her voice was natural in tone but her speech was only fairly intelligible. She was transferred to a private school at the age of 6 years 11 months on the advice of the Head Master of the special school and had been there for 2 years.

She appeared to miss a great deal of the lessons but she was a determined child and, in a small class, she received adequate attention. She had tenacity of purpose and was making progress that was commensurate with her dual handicap.

GROUP 6

Children in Technical Schools

One girl, number 23, was a pupil at a Technical School for Girls. She could be classified as:—

Class 1. Clearly Successful. 1. Number 23.

Class 1

Number 23 was severely deaf and was transferred from a unit for the partially hearing to an ordinary junior school at the age of 7 years 0 months.

She proceeded from there to a Technical School on the result of the 11+ examination and was, at the time of the enquiry, in her second year. She missed much of her lessons but she was keen to work and received help and encouragement from her parents, who were both in the teaching profession. Unlike the majority of children seen during the survey, mathematics was her best subject. She was an avid reader. She used books well and was clearly successful at school.

TABLE XIII

AUDIOGRAM, I.Q. AND CLASS OF 1 CHILD AT A TECHNICAL SCHOOL FOR GIRLS

Number of child	Ear	Hearing Loss in Decibels					I.Q.	Test Used	Class based on observation
		250	500	1K	2K	4K			
23	L	40	80	90	95	70	Above Average	—	1
	R	40	65	80	80	65			

GROUP 7

Children in Grammar Schools

Five children, numbers 9, 11, 16, 17 and 19, were attending Grammar Schools; three of them were transferred from Schools for the Deaf and two from Units for the Partially Hearing, all at the recognised age for transfer to secondary schools. The picture here was not so clear as that seen in the secondary modern schools where the pupils were in examination forms. The circumstances of transfer, though in appearance straightforward, were actually more complex. Three of the children were not fitted for the pressures of academic study in grammar schools, although they were more suitably placed in ordinary schools than they were in special schools. Their ability had been over-estimated and they had not been able to maintain the pace that was demanded of them.

An assessment from observations made during the visits gave the following result:—

- | | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|
| Class 1. Clearly Successful | 2. Numbers 11 and 17. |
| Class 2. Moderately .. | 2. .. 9 and 19. |
| Class 3. Doubtfully .. | 1. Number 16. |

Class 1

Number 11, a severely deaf girl, was making excellent progress. She was in her fourth year and, after a slow start, was improving rapidly and settling well to her academic work. She read widely and her great interest lay in the study of history, a subject in which she hoped to qualify as a teacher if her hearing loss did not prevent it. She found mathematics very difficult but her parents were able to give her the help she needed to make progress in the subject.

Number 17 was a severely deaf boy whose ability was not outstanding but his personality was such that help over difficulties was always forthcoming both at school and at home. He was making good progress.

Both these children had peculiarities of articulation in their speech but spoke fluently and conversed easily.

Class 2

Two of the children, numbers 9 and 19, were working under great strain and would probably have been better placed in secondary modern schools where the pace would have been less severe. Like number 8 (see page 11) their attainment had remained static, and complaint was made by their teachers about their lack of progress. Neither of them had any academic interest in study and would probably have benefitted from a broader curriculum in secondary modern schools, where they might have been able to prepare for external examinations of a less high standard than those taken in grammar schools. The Head Teachers were concerned to notice that these pupils' places in form dropped lower in each succeeding year.

Class 3

Number 16, a Polish girl, faced great difficulties. She was severely deaf and no English was spoken in her home. Her parents arranged for special tuition from an ordinary teacher for 2 hours a week and she had some specialist help from a Teacher of the Deaf during school hours; but she was making very poor progress. She appeared to be wrongly placed.

TABLE XIV

AUDIOGRAMS, I.Q.'s AND CLASSES OF 5 CHILDREN IN GRAMMAR SCHOOLS

Number of child	Ear	Hearing Loss in Decibels					I.Q. or H.M.'s Estimate	Test Used	Class based on observation
		250	500	1K	2K	4K			
11	L	20	50	50	70	70	Superior	—	1
	R	20	40	60	80	60			
17	L	75	75	75	75	75	122	Bradford 11+	1
	R	75	75	75	75	75			
9	L	60	60	60	60	60	120	"	2
	R	60	60	60	60	60			
19	L	40	90	100	95	80	115	W.I.S.C.(P)	2
	R	40	50	90	80	90			
16	L	55	75	80	80	100	110	W.I.S.C.(P)	3
	R	80	90	100	100	100			

GROUP 8

Students in Colleges of Further Education

One student was attending a College of Further Education.

She could be classified as:—

Class 2. Moderately Successful. 1. Number 3.

This girl was admitted to a School for the Deaf at 3 years 6 months and was transferred to a School for the Partially-Hearing at 8 years where she made such progress that the Head Master considered her to be of high intelligence and a certain candidate for the Mary Hare Grammar School for the Deaf. Her parents were not willing for her to sit for the entrance examination and withdrew her from the school at 11 years 10 months. She was admitted to a private High School for Girls where she

remained for 4 years, working in a small class with girls one year younger than herself. She read widely and the Head Mistress was satisfied with her progress. She anticipated entering her for several subjects in G.C.E. but the parents became dissatisfied, and withdrew the girl when she was 15 years of age and presented her for the entrance examination to a one-year course in General Office Training at a College of Further Education.

This transfer brought unexpected difficulties; the rooms at the College of Further Education were reverberant and rendered a hearing aid almost useless; the teaching was too fast-moving; the teachers were unaware of her special needs and she became discouraged. She eventually lost all interest in the course itself, but she took great pleasure in the social life of the College and had a part to play in it. She was achieving nothing in her work, and the members of staff who taught here were out of sympathy with her retention as a student. It was clear that adverse learning conditions had affected her attitude and progress, but because of the early promise shown at both the Special School and the private High School, she has been graded as Class 2 rather than Class 4.

TABLE XV
AUDIOGRAM, I.Q. AND CLASS OF 1 STUDENT AT A COLLEGE OF FURTHER
EDUCATION

Number of child	Ear	Hearing Loss in Decibels					IQ or H.M.'s Estimate	Test Used	Class based on observation
		250	500	1K	2K	4K			
3	L	75	85	90	85	95	118	Wechsler(P)	2
	R	45	60	70	65	60			

GROUP 9

Students in Colleges of Art

Two students form this group. One of them, number 1 had left her college before the programme of visits was begun and the other, number 2 was still a student at a College of Art. They were both profoundly deaf; their speech was unintelligible and they would have been considered by people connected with the education of deaf children, to be too handicapped to take their place in an ordinary school. As an experiment, they were placed during their last year at the special school, at the age of 15, in the College of Art in the same town as their School for the Deaf, to take a general course for one year, returning each evening to the security and friendships of the special school. This appeared to be successful and they made progress. At 16 on reaching school leaving age, both were transferred to the College of Art nearest their homes from which they travelled daily, the one to take a course in Needlework and the other a course in Textile Design.

They could be classified as:—

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|
| Class 3. Doubtfully Successful | 1. Number 2 |
| Class 4. Very Doubtfully Successful | 1. Number 1 |

Class 3

Number 2, the younger girl, was of superior intelligence and personality. She was struggling to maintain her place in the full course in Textile Design. She gained nothing from the lectures themselves, the pace of

which was too fast; nor, because of her limited knowledge of language, could she read the prescribed books or embark upon a thesis. The lecturers prepared typewritten notes for her to study but these gave inadequate depth to the subject and it seemed unlikely that she would be able to complete the course of three years' work successfully. At the time of the visit she was in her first year. She was well liked, and was accepted as a pet is accepted, but her loneliness amid the gay life of the students was profound.

Class 4

Number 1, the older girl, followed an adapted course agreed by the Principal of the College from which all academic work was omitted, so that her work was entirely practical, although some of the lecturers provided her with typewritten notes. The purpose of this course, which was not clear, was a matter of concern to the Principal. The student herself was unable to maintain her interest in it and abandoned it. With the help of the Principal, she then obtained a job in a local firm of Heraldic Designers where she was giving satisfaction. She had been well liked in the College and had been accepted by her fellow students, but there was little opportunity for social life there and she had remained on the fringe of student activities through lack of easy communication.

TABLE XVI

AUDIOGRAMS, I.Q.'s AND CLASSES OF 2 STUDENTS AT COLLEGES OF ART

Number of child	Ear	Hearing Loss in Decibels					IQ or H.M.'s Estimate	Test Used	Class based on observation
		250	500	1K	2K	4K			
2	L	85	100	110	110	x	Above Average	—	3
	R	90	100	120	x	x			
1	L	90	110	120	x	x	Above Average	—	4
	R	No response							

Summary

TABLE XVII

A SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT OF PROGRESS, SHOWING TYPES OF SCHOOLS ATTENDED

	Class 1 Clearly Successful		Class 2 Moderately Successful		Class 3 Doubtfully Successful		Class 4 V. Doubt. Successful		Total
	Deaf P. H'g.		Deaf P. H'g.		Deaf P. H'g.		Deaf P. H'g.		
Primary Schools ...	1	1	—	—	1	—	1	—	4
Secondary Modern Schools (non-exam.) ...	—	—	—	2	2	1	1	1	7
Secondary Modern Schools (exam.) ...	—	4	1	1	—	—	—	—	6
Open Air Schools ...	—	—	—	1	—	—	1	—	2
Private Schools ...	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
Technical Schools ...	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
Grammar Schools ...	2	—	1	1	1	—	—	—	5
Colleges of Further Education ...	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	1
Colleges of Art ...	—	—	—	—	1	—	1	—	2
	4	6	2	6	5	1	4	1	29

TABLE XVIII

CLASSIFICATION OF CHILDREN SHOWING TYPE OF SPECIAL SCHOOL FROM WHICH THEY WERE TRANSFERRED

	Class 1 Clearly Successful	Class 2 Moderately Successful	Class 3 Doubtfully Successful	Class 4 V. Doubt. Successful	Returned to Special School	Total
1. Units for the Partially Hearing	3	1	2	—	—	6
2. Schools for the Deaf/Units for the Partially Hearing...	—	2	2	3	—	7
3. Schools for the Partially Hearing	—	1	—	—	—	1
4. Schools for the Deaf/Schools for the Partially Hearing...	—	1	—	—	—	1
5. Schools for the Deaf	7	3	2	2	4	18
	10	8	6	5	4	33

Note

Line 2. These children first attended a School for the Deaf and were transferred later to a Unit for the Partially Hearing.

Line 3. These children first attended a School for the Deaf and were transferred later to a School for the Partially Hearing.

Line 5. Two of these children attended a School for the Deaf which was later reorganised as a School for the Partially Hearing.

The figures seem to indicate that there is no correlation between integration and types of special schools from which the children were transferred.

TABLE XIX

DEGREE OF DEAFNESS OF CHILDREN WHO WERE CLEARLY SUCCESSFUL IN ORDINARY SCHOOLS

	Profoundly Deaf	Severely Deaf	Severely P. Deaf	Partially Hearing	Total
Primary Schools Nos.	—	—	30	27	2
Secondary Modern Schools (non-exam.)	—	—	—	—	—
Secondary Modern Schools (exam.)	—	—	26	10, 12, 18	4
Private Schools	—	—	—	29	1
Technical Schools	—	23	—	—	1
Grammar Schools	—	17	11	—	2
	—	2	3	5	10

TABLE XX

DEGREE OF DEAFNESS OF CHILDREN WHO WERE MODERATELY SUCCESSFUL IN ORDINARY SCHOOLS

	Pro- foundly Deaf	Severely Deaf	Severely P. Deaf	Partially Hearing	Total
Primary Schools Nos.	—	—	—	—	—
Secondary Modern Schools (non-exam.) "	—	—	—	4, 8	2
Secondary Modern Schools (exam.) "	—	22	—	6	2
Open Air Schools "	—	—	—	32	1
Grammar Schools "	—	19	—	9	2
Colleges of Further Education "	—	—	—	3	1
	—	2	—	6	8

Note

The terms "profoundly deaf", "severely deaf", "severely partially deaf" and "partially hearing" were used as descriptive of the children from observation and after scrutiny of their audiograms. All of them, except numbers 4 and 9 wore hearing aids continuously at school and at home.

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION WITH TEACHERS AT ORDINARY SCHOOLS

General Discussion

The teachers who were most concerned with the deaf pupils in the ordinary schools, the class teachers in primary schools and form masters and form mistresses in secondary schools, showed themselves, in the majority of cases, to be interested and ready to accept children with severely impaired hearing into their care. Too often, however, they had little or no knowledge of the handicaps imposed by impaired hearing and their consequent effects upon speech and language development and upon communication and social growth. Very few of them had received any guidance or help in the handling of deaf children, and most of them were anxious to discuss their problems in order to understand the children better.

The speech of many of the children was of such good quality that the teachers had not been aware of the severe nature of the handicap suffered by the children. With exception of the four girls who were profoundly deaf, two at Colleges of Art, one at an Open Air School and one whose admission to a Secondary Modern School had been demanded by her mother, all the children spoke with natural intonation and varying degrees of fluency. Since, at the start of their school lives, they had had either no speech or only a few intelligible words, they showed clearly how well they had been taught in the early stages in the special schools and units, and the success with which auditory stimulus and training had been given. Some children still retained mistakes of articulation that were due to imperfect hearing and these were wrongly diagnosed by the teachers in the ordinary schools as speech defects that could not be eradicated, rather than as mistakes due to deafness that continued speech training might have cured.

Almost without exception, the desks in the classrooms were arranged in rows and the deaf children occupied centre front positions. For many years this has been assumed to be the most favourable position in class for a deaf child but more thought might be given to this belief. In crowded classrooms, where the front row of desks is very close to the teacher's, the deaf child has a very distorted view of the teacher's face and mouth; he has no view of the faces of the rest of the members of the class unless he turns round and, in so doing he is in trouble for bad behaviour; he cannot follow when the teacher moves about the room; he cannot hear the contributions to discussion that come from his classmates behind him. None of the teachers had realised how much their deaf pupils were missing, either through use of words outside the deaf pupils' known vocabulary, or through inaudibility of the speech of the rest of the class, or through their own teaching habits of moving about or through poor acoustics in the room.

Several of the teachers recognised that their deaf pupils were relying to some extent upon lipreading but there was very little understanding of the significance of the term. They regarded it as a skill inherently possessed by people who are severely deaf, to allow them to understand the speech of others. They were unaware of its limitations: of the need for a good, clear pattern of speech in a good light: of the need to use known vocabulary and to teach new vocabulary: of the difficulty that arises when the ball of discussion is thrown too fast: of the difficulty in locating the speakers: of the need for intense concentration if the thread of meaning is to be held. They could not grasp, without guidance, the strain that their deaf pupils were facing.

The limited power of hearing aids was not realised and too often it was assumed: "He hears when he wants to". Hearing aids were regarded by the majority of the teachers in the ordinary schools as the answer to all problems of deafness and they had had no means of finding out that the usefulness and efficiency of hearing aids is limited beyond certain degrees of deafness and in certain circumstances. Some schools occupied noisy positions on main roads; some, although in quiet situations, were of modern design in which reverberation from large panes of glass and bare walls created noise that masked the sounds of speech; one was heated by a system that was so noisy that it covered the output of the hearing aid. Few teachers had been given the vital information that extraneous noises can overwhelm speech and that the efficiency of the hearing aid decreases in direct relation to distance from the speaker.

Discussion with Teachers in Primary Schools

Teachers in infants' schools and junior schools, who had been given no help in understanding the handicap of deafness, were unaware that the limited speed used by a deaf child indicated a parallel limitation in knowledge of language. They had not realised that, where deafness is severe, language must be consciously taught: it does not develop at the same rate as that of the hearing child unless much extra attention is given to it. They had not realised how much was contributed by those parents who had had good guidance themselves in the early stages. The need for extra help in language development was under-estimated. The teachers had had insufficient experience with deaf children to learn for themselves that the momentum that is gathered by young children whose hearing is good, in mastering their mother tongue, is denied the young deaf child, whose facility with words is gained more slowly.

Teachers of young children in the ordinary schools tended to make too many allowances for the deaf children in the early years, on the assumption that, because of their handicap, they could do no better. They tended to make their judgment solely on social adjustment and behaviour rather than on educational growth. The widening gap in educational attainment between deaf children and their hearing companions in class, that became more obvious with the passing of time, was a source of worry as the children grew older. In four cases, the children had been returned to their special schools.

The Head Master who had retained a severely deaf boy for an additional year after the eleven plus examination, was deeply concerned that the boy's results at the second attempt showed no improvement.

Discussion with Teachers in Secondary Schools

Fourteen children had been transferred from special schools and units to ordinary schools at eleven years of age or older. The majority of them were speaking fairly fluently but their use of written language varied widely. The teachers in the ordinary schools were unaware of the effort that had been expended in bringing the pupils to the standards that had been achieved by the time of transfer, and of the further effort that would be needed if they were to continue their educational growth, and reach their innate potential. The teachers expected language, its appreciation and its use, to improve without any more attention than that given to the rest of the form. Where the standards of written work were poor, the teachers tended to regard these deaf children as educationally sub-normal rather than to take cognisance of the effects of a severe educational handicap. In most cases, they did not realise that the deaf children in their classes were capable of a much higher standard of work than they were achieving at that time.

In a few cases, an Organiser of the Education of Deaf Children had introduced the children to their ordinary schools and had given a little guidance to the teachers there. There was some evidence to show that these teachers accepted the children with sympathy and were less objectively critical than those to whom children had gone without introduction.

The teachers noted that, in some cases, the quality of written work was high but in the case of the less secure pupils it was poor. A great deal of the muddle and many of the mistakes could be attributed to lack of precise hearing and called for special attention. At the present time of staff shortages, it is unlikely that enough special tuition could be arranged in most secondary schools.

Several of the pupils in the secondary schools were unable to read their text books and English course books with full comprehension. This was not always attributable to any mechanical inability to read, nor always to paucity of vocabulary and language. The teachers were at a loss to understand this situation because they had not realised that some of the children lacked that background of knowledge that comes to the child who hears, through the experimentation, discovery and discussion that goes on in the good primary school today and the talk that surrounds him out of school. These deaf children had spent their primary years learning the techniques of speech and the intricacies of verbal expression whilst the wider aspects of education had passed them by.

Those deaf children who were able to read with full understanding were those whose parents had themselves been able to give this wider background

of knowledge and had encouraged their children to read widely and to use books well. The part taken by some of the parents in the educational development of their children was seldom fully recognised by the teachers. In one or two cases, parental influence was so great that the actual ability and attainment of the children was masked. In these cases the teachers had an incorrect idea of their deaf pupils' progress and were disappointed by the examination results which usually showed how much was due to parental help during the term.

Some teachers were also disappointed when the progress of their deaf pupils, as shown by examination results, appeared to deteriorate as the years passed and they sought an explanation. There could be two reasons for it. The first, that the majority of deaf children seen during the progress of the survey, were relying upon lipreading to a considerable extent. They could not hear, in the classroom situation, "over the shoulder" and missed the stimulus to learning that came from the discussion that went on during lessons. They sat in front rows, and questions or answers that came from behind were inaudible to them. The lesson notes from which they revised contained only the bare essentials and they were not reading enough to compensate for their lack of full understanding. The second reason could be that some deaf children appear to mark time in language development across the years of adolescence. A marking time would manifest itself as a deterioration when other children were going steadily forward.

Three only of the deaf children seen in the ordinary schools had any ability in mathematics. Their teachers complained about lack of foundation, lack of mathematical vocabulary, of mental agility, of reasoning and mathematical thought.

Discussion with Teachers in Colleges of Further Education

The teachers in the College of Further Education were critical of the partially-hearing girl who had been admitted as a full-time student to a One Year Course in General Office Training. She spoke fluently but with a slight peculiarity and the teachers were unaware of the difficulties she was meeting in her class work. Because of lack of understanding, they had become unwilling to help her, and it was unlikely that they would recommend her for a second year of training such as was offered to promising students.

Discussion with Teachers in Colleges of Art

The teachers in the two Colleges of Art were deeply concerned about the two profoundly deaf girls who had been admitted as full-time students to courses for which they did not consider them fitted. Although anxious to help them, the teachers were doubtful of the usefulness of adapted courses that would, by virtue of the adaptation, prevent the girls from obtaining qualifications at the end.

Discussion with Peripatetic Teachers of the Deaf

One Organiser of the Education of Deaf children and three peripatetic teachers were seen at work in the ordinary schools. Two of the peripatetic teachers were appointed to serve county areas and worked under the supervision of the County Schools' Medical Officer. The third was appointed by a Local Education Authority to meet the educational needs of deaf children transferred from its units for the Partially Hearing to ordinary schools in the city.

These teachers were conscious of their inadequacy, of their inability to find out what the children were doing in their lessons, to what extent they were succeeding and where their main needs lay. They sometimes had access to schemes of work, but these gave no indication of the actual content of lessons. In the majority of cases, the children brought them copied notes that were useless as a guide to classwork and to their difficulties.

The peripatetic teachers relied to a certain extent upon reports received from class teachers. These were not always a clear indication of progress since the teachers themselves were not always able to assess it. The peripatetic teachers were not all experienced teachers who would be able to recognise standards of work in ordinary schools, nor were they all fully experienced teachers of the Deaf, who would be able to assess difficulties in learning attributable to deafness. In those schools where free expression was sacrificed to English course books and copied notes, there was little opportunity for the peripatetic teachers to make valid assessments.

They were pressed for time and were unable to give as much care and attention to each individual child as would be needed for him to make the progress of which he was innately capable. Overcrowded schools could not always provide either suitable space in which to work or time in which to discuss the children with their class teachers.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION WITH PARENTS AND CHILDREN

Discussion with parents in the homes

It was a great privilege to visit the parents of the children in their homes, to be given such a warm welcome and to receive their confidences. They were all full of anxiety about their deaf children and, although desiring most of all that they should maintain their places in the ordinary school, were yet, in several cases, full of doubt as to the wisdom of the transfer.

They regretted their inability to assess their deaf children's progress and standards of work in relation to other children of the same age at the school, who heard normally. Homework gave some indication but lesson notes were inadequate for forming any opinion since, so often, they were copied.

One parent, whose son was in a form preparing for the G.C.E. examination, was very anxious about his ability to stand on his own feet when the time for the examination came round. His stepmother gave him such help with interpreting and extending his lesson notes, with guiding his search for information in books and with his homework, that she felt his teachers did not grasp the real situation nor realise the poor standard of which he was actually capable when left to work on his own.

The children who were set no homework, or who did their homework at school, were a still greater problem. Examination results gave no satisfactory indication of progress. The parents felt the need for closer connection with the schools. They missed the opportunities they had had for frequent discussion with teachers and Head Teachers in the Special Schools and Units.

One or two parents were concerned about the amount of general education that their deaf children had missed during the early years, when they

were learning to speak and gaining basic vocabulary, and they asked for advice in making up the deficiencies. They were concerned about giving moral training and inculcating right judgements and values to children whose vocabulary and language were limited and whose power of abstract thought was undeveloped.

Some parents had been confused by the conflicting advice given to them in the early years when they were seeking educational guidance. Very few of them had had the early guidance that is now obtainable at the pre-school clinics. Their minds were full of doubt about the course they had taken, and about the lack of agreement between experts when deaf children were of an age to be placed in a school.

They were worried about the possibilities of obtaining satisfying employment, but few of them had spared thought for the strain to which their children had been put in trying to compete on unequal terms with children who could hear.

Finally, as the children reached the end of their secondary school courses, those parents who had children at this stage became afraid for them. They feared social isolation. This fear stemmed from observation of the changed pattern of social habits since the onset of adolescence. They realised that the secondary schools offered many facilities for social activities in clubs which met both in and out of school hours. Youth Clubs were available in the neighbourhood and yet the deaf boys and girls resisted any suggestion that they should join. Those who were without deaf friends to whom to turn for relaxation in leisure, preferred either to seek out one special friend or to live their own lives within the shelter of the home, protected by the family group. This change from the easy play-companionship in pre-adolescence to near isolation as teenagers set up doubts in the minds of these few parents as to the wisdom of transferring severely deaf children to ordinary schools.

Discussion with Children in their Homes

Children of Primary Age

There were only four children of primary age included in the survey. These four were still at the play stage in childhood. They were working under strain in their schools but they all had parents who gave them absolute security and love, and could help them to extend their language through family outings, good talk and practice in reading. Outside their homes, they had friends with whom they could play the active games of their age although they did not always understand what the play was about. This strain was offset by the relaxation they had in their homes.

Children of Secondary Age

Chatting with the older children at home, it was made quite clear that the majority of them were working under great strain but that they nearly all had a great desire to maintain their places and to do well. All but two confessed to hearing little or nothing of the discussion that went on around them in class, and to finding their lesson notes inadequate for revision when the time came for examinations. Some of them understood little of the content of some lessons but personal pride would not allow them to draw attention to themselves by asking the teachers for further explanation. One or two would appeal to a trusted, sympathetic teacher at the end of the period but the majority did not do so.

They took their difficulties home for conscientious, thoughtful parents to make plain while the less able floundered in their morass of misunderstanding.

The majority had found the change from the intimate atmosphere of special schools and units, and the friendliness of small primary schools, to the uncertainty of large secondary schools very bewildering. Here they were confronted with a situation for which their minds were not prepared. They had not anticipated the difficulties that arose when they went from the care of a class teacher who understood their handicap to specialist teachers who did not. They found it difficult, with their limited ability to hear and to lipread, to adapt themselves to the new ways of learning and to concentrate in each period on a different teacher with a different personality and a different approach.

Understanding the speech of teachers, who were making no allowances for them, was a new factor with which to contend. Gently nurtured as they had been in the special schools and units, and able to follow the lessons with ease, several children complained that the teachers in the secondary schools spoke too quickly and seldom repeated anything. The other children in class also spoke too quickly and too quietly for them.

It became apparent that the children adapted themselves in varying degrees:

1. Some understood every teacher's speech.
2. Some understood only some of the teachers' speech.
3. Some were handicapped by the strangeness of new language, new subjects, new ideas and new forms of reasoning.
4. Some were handicapped by their own paucity of language and inability to understand the form of sentence used.
5. Many were unable to follow any of the discussion that took place between teacher and class, and so lost much of the value of the lesson and much of the sense of belonging to the group.
6. Many were more dependent upon lipreading than had been anticipated at the time of transfer. Listening conditions were so much less good in the secondary schools.

The most successful amongst them had learned to read well. They had sought information from books and had become avid readers but the majority had not learned the value of books and had not been sufficiently guided in their use. The subjects most enjoyed by the successful children were those such as history and geography about which they could seek information in the libraries.

As regards their reading habits the children seemed to fall into three categories:

1. Those who were skilled readers, who used books well and read both for information and for pleasure ;
2. Those who were able to read with full comprehension but who were not willing to read on their own and did not read for information and interest ;
3. Those whose ability to read was limited and whose comprehension was poor.

Five of the children could be included in the first category, seven in the second and twelve in the third.

Some of the children were very conscious of their increasing failure in examinations. They were worried about it and expressed their discouragement.

Several of the children spoke about the length of time that had elapsed before they felt quite settled in their schools and had gained enough confidence to answer in class. Some of them retained immaturities and inaccuracies in their speech, and frequently mis-pronounced words that they had only met in reading. This had led in some cases to teasing and unhappiness and to a certain amount of antipathy in the early years at the secondary schools.

The children's loneliness was an accepted part of their lives. It was part of their handicap. Because of their insecurity at school, few of them were members of any group or gang of hearing children, and few had enough courage to join school clubs. Wherever possible, they spent their leisure time with deaf or partially-hearing friends with whom they could be completely relaxed.

Those who had become separated from their former deaf or partially-hearing school companions relied upon one special friend in school to give them confidence and one friend at home with whom to share interests. It was noticeable that the interests they shared were hobbies and activities of a practical nature where conversation could be kept to a minimum. Train spotting, stamp and foreign coin collecting, fishing and riding were all mentioned.

The pattern of social behaviour that evolves naturally amongst children who hear normally, from the play of early childhood, into conversation at adolescence and the sharing of ideas and the development of social clubs for trying out those ideas for teenagers, mediates against children who are deaf and cannot join easily in conversation in a group. The effects of this changing pattern upon deaf children could be traced in the social habits of the children seen during the survey.

There was a twelve-year old girl who was young for her age. She was disturbed to find that her former playmates in the neighbourhood were no longer ready to play with her and she could not understand their changed attitude. There was a twelve-year old boy who had himself put play behind him and was withdrawing into himself since the next stage of sharing activities through conversation was too difficult for him. There was a thirteen-year old girl who had been rebuffed because of her inability to converse easily. There was a fourteen-year old boy who could not summon up enough courage to join the social activities at his school even though he was a good footballer and was readily accepted as a team member. There was the fifteen-year old girl who could not face the social demands of life and, in ill-adjustment, had withdraw completely within herself. Observation of all the children showed the great strain that they must endure in order to maintain their identities amongst people who are so much better endowed than themselves and who hear well.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS

General

1. Direct comparison between deaf children transferred from English Special Schools to ordinary schools and deaf children transferred from the Lexington School is not possible, since the reasons for transfer from the English schools were so much more variable than those at Lexington.

The Child

1. Integration of a severely deaf child into an ordinary school must be studied from two aspects, academic and social.

2. For academic success, the child must have:—

(a) Good intelligence.

(b) Strength of character to withstand the loneliness, the insecurity and the bewilderment of the early months of the new venture.

(c) Determination to succeed.

(d) Single-minded tenacity of purpose in pursuit of success.

3. The child would have a greater chance of success if he were prepared for change in ways of learning; helped to realise that children who hear also experience difficulties; and persuaded to go to his teacher with his problems and to ask for further explanation.

4. Before he is transferred, the child should know the value of books. He should be able and eager to read widely for information, for interest and for pleasure before he reaches the secondary stage, so that skill and desire to read go together to make self-education possible.

The Special School

1. It would appear that transfer of a severely deaf child from a special school to an ordinary school before the age of 5, before a good foundation of language has been laid, is likely to lead to failure.

2. There is equally some evidence to show that transfer can be delayed too long. Children who were transferred to an ordinary school after the 11+ examination were found, in some cases, to have had difficulty in making social adjustments and in adapting themselves to new ways of learning.

3. When transfer from special school to ordinary school is recommended, those making the recommendation should, if possible:—

(a) Know the ordinary school well and be able to assess whether or not it will provide the right atmosphere for academic and social integration.

(b) Know the conditions under which the child will work.

(c) Know the standard of work and the background of knowledge that is required to maintain a place in it.

(d) Be able to prepare the child for the difficulties that will beset him.

4. The child must be made aware of the different conditions that he will meet when he goes to a school where no allowances are made for his handicap and where he himself must be adaptable and ready to meet the new situation.

5. The child must be made ready for the difficulties that will arise when acoustics are bad and when conditions for lipreading are no longer made easy for him.

6. Speech audiograms can be misleading. A 100% response under ideal listening conditions is no indication of equal response under ordinary classroom conditions.

7. Natural intonation in speech and an ability to answer in colloquial phrases are insufficient attainments on which to assess readiness for transfer. Facility in the use of spoken language and wide vocabulary are needed if the child is to understand and profit from his lessons in an ordinary school.

8. It is important that general education in the primary years at a special school shall keep pace with special training in speech and language, so that thinking and reasoning are stimulated and language is developed beyond the simple sentence.

9. There is evidence of a need to review the methods of teaching mathematics in special schools and units.

The Ordinary School

1. There is need for guidance from official sources for the staff of ordinary schools where severely deaf children are pupils so that the teachers may understand:—

- (a) The nature of the handicap of deafness and the educational barriers that it sets up against learning to speak and learning to understand the meaning and use of language.
- (b) The limitations of lipreading as a skill of communication.
- (c) The effects of teaching habits on the deaf child who needs always to have a good view of any speaker's face so that lipreading may combine with hearing to make for better understanding.
- (d) The necessity for their own speech to be clear in order to lessen the strain under which the child is labouring.
- (e) The use of hearing aids, the conditions needed for maximum output, the relative degrees to which they help the individual child and their limitations in the ordinary classroom situation.

2. There is need for both teachers and fellow pupils to recognise that the peculiarities that are evident in a severely deaf child's speech are usually due to imperfections in hearing and can often be eliminated. Relationships might then improve more quickly and small irritations disappear.

3. The teachers should be aware of the strain that the deaf child undergoes when he cannot hear the quiet or mumbled speech of his fellows in class.

4. Those who teach deaf children should be made aware of the strain that is imposed upon the deaf child who, in every successive lesson, must concentrate without pause. For him, there are no lighter moments of relaxation in an oral lesson.

5. The teachers need to be made aware of the slow development of language when it is learned, not by the natural and precise means of learning, but by the unnatural means of sight and imperfect hearing, and of the gap in understanding that widens between the hearing and the deaf child as they grow older. Assessment of progress by observation of social development in the early years is not enough. Social growth and educational growth should be judged together.

6. The teachers need to be shown that the poor written work produced by some severely deaf children, although similar to that of E.S.N. children does not always indicate poor mentality and that it might be improved with careful teaching.

7. The teachers should help the deaf child to realise that information missed in class can be sought in books. They should guide his reading in order to compensate for the inadequacy of lesson notes.

8. Objective criticism should be applied to every deaf child to make sure that his progress, so far as is possible, is commensurate with his innate ability.

9. It would seem that the traditional placing of a deaf child in the centre front desk in class is not always the most advantageous position. Further thought might be given to this problem to ensure that each deaf child is seated where he will receive most benefit and be under the least strain.

10. The teachers should have an opportunity to discuss the deaf child with his parents, in order to know how much help is given at home and how much the child can achieve unaided.

The Parents

1. The parents should try to give their deaf child a feeling of absolute security and support and a home in which, while accepting a responsible part as a member of it, he can be completely relaxed.

2. They should understand the strain under which their child is working in school and his need for relaxation.

3. They should be able to recognise when their child has reached his potential, how far he can go without help and how far it is wise to stretch him. They must be helped to understand the unequal terms on which he is working in an ordinary school.

4. They should be able to give or to provide help with work that has been imperfectly understood in class.

5. They should be given opportunity to discuss the child's problems with his teachers in order to help him reach his potential.

6. They should be given advice on inculcating moral values and right judgments and in helping their child to become a responsible person.

7. They should be helped to understand the changing pattern in social behaviour in childhood and the strain that is imposed upon the deaf teenager when he attempts to become part of a social group. They must realise his need for complete relaxation from strain if he is to become a balanced adult.

Observation, Guidance and Specialist Help

1. There was evidence of need for close follow-up of progress and adjustment of the severely deaf child when transferred to an ordinary school and for provision of more special help in many cases.

2. Many of the teachers showed themselves to be anxious to have advice on the handling of deaf children, but at this time of staff shortages and large classes it would seem unlikely that enough individual help can be provided by the teachers themselves.

3. There is need to study the several different ways in which specialist help is provided for deaf children who are attending ordinary schools. Some would appear to involve a great waste of time both for the children and for the teachers, and to allow for too little liaison between the specialist and the school.

4. There is a growing need for assessment of the work of peripatetic teachers of the deaf, who provide a service which is extending rapidly and in which there are as yet no standards or guiding lines along which to make progress.

The growth of the service, the lack of experienced teachers to undertake it, the pressure of time and the difficult conditions in overcrowded schools call for investigation at this time when Local Education Authorities are becoming aware of the needs of the many children with impaired hearing who are in their schools.

5. There was such evidence of difficulty that there might be closer study of deaf children in ordinary schools, across the years of adolescence, in order to reach valid conclusions about the problems that manifest themselves and appear to affect progress.

Final Conclusions

1. The factors which determine whether or not a severely deaf child, considered to be so severely handicapped as to need special educational treatment in the early stages, will make good educational progress in an ordinary school are not simple. There is no single factor. Hearing loss, although significant, is not conclusive. Each child must be studied as a whole person, taking into account his home environment, his social adjustment, his personality, his ability and the degree of strain to which he might reasonably be put.

2. Evidence from this very limited survey shows that only in exceptional circumstances can severely deaf children who needed to start their education in special schools, make good academic progress in ordinary schools along with children who hear normally.

3. Only very few severely deaf children can achieve academic success in an ordinary school. For the majority it would seem that the main advantage to be gained by education in an ordinary school is the assumption of a normal code of behaviour through association with ordinary children. This seems likely to be offset by a less high standard of academic attainment than innate potential would suggest, unless much help can be provided out of school hours.

4. There was some evidence to show that, in exceptional circumstances, there may be a possibility of academic success when the hearing loss is as low as 70db over the speech frequencies.

5. In less favourable circumstances, such a hearing loss would be too great.

6. The strain imposed upon the severely deaf child in his attempt to maintain his place in an ordinary school cannot be measured. It should not be minimised. In his power of imitation, he is adept at assuming the cloak of similarity to give the appearance of taking a full part in the corporate life of the society in which he finds himself. The strain involved in this effort should never be overlooked. It should be given proper consideration by all concerned with the child when transfer is contemplated.

7. From the limited number of cases studied, it appeared that although the severely deaf child appears to be an integrated member of the community, it is impossible for him to take a full and satisfying part in the social life of an ordinary school even though he might be successful in his academic work.

8. There was no evidence to show that a profoundly deaf child could maintain a place in an ordinary school.

9. It was clear that when recommendation is made for transfer of a severely deaf child from a special school to an ordinary school, everyone concerned in it, parents, Medical Officers, Head Teachers of Special Schools and Head Teachers of ordinary Schools, must be made aware of the difficulties and strains that will be involved in order to assess the ability of the child to face them. The decision should not rest in the hands of one person. After full consultation with the parents, it should be taken as a result of observation and assessment by a team of workers who understand the educational and social problems set by the handicap of impaired hearing.

APPENDIX

SCHOOLS AND UNITS TO WHICH APPROACH WAS MADE SCHOOLS FOR THE DEAF AND SCHOOLS FOR THE DEAF AND PARTIALLY HEARING

Birmingham	*Braidwood School
					*Longwill School
					Royal School
Bolton	Thomasson Memorial School
Bradford	*Odsal House School
Bristol	*Elmfield School
Derby	Royal School
Doncaster	*Yorkshire Residential School
Hull	Sutton School
Leicester	*Stoneleigh Special School
Liverpool	*School for the Deaf and Partially Hearing
Manchester	Royal Residential Schools
Nottingham	Ewing School
Oldham	*Beever Special School
Preston	Royal Cross Schools
Sheffield	*Maud Maxfield School
Stoke-on-Trent	The Mount School

SCHOOLS FOR THE PARTIALLY HEARING

Birkdale	School for the Partially Hearing
Leeds	*Elmete Hall School
Burton-on-Trent	*Needwood School
Welwyn	Tewin Water School

UNITS FOR THE PARTIALLY HEARING AT

*Bristol
Coventry
*Gillingham
Manchester
Oxford
*Reading
Salford
Shrewsbury

* Pupils from these schools and units were included in the survey.